



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dr. Riley's method, the patience and thoroughness of his research, the fairness and general sanity of his judgments, are all good models for imitation. There is doubtless much that yet remains to be done but the value of his work is much more than that of a source-book. As a finished product it is likely to hold its place as an authority in the field it has so thoroughly explored for a long time to come.

ALEXANDER T. ORMOND.

The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century. By HERBERT L. OSGOOD, Ph.D., Professor of History in Columbia University. Volume III. *Imperial Control. Beginnings of the System of Royal Provinces.* (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1907. Pp. xxii, 551.)

WITH this volume Professor Osgood completes a study of the colonies in the seventeenth century which may justly be deemed the most important interpretation of our colonial history that has thus far been made. In the earlier volumes he dealt in the main with the internal history of the proprietary and corporate colonies; in the volume before us he takes up the relation of all the colonies with the home government, and the beginnings of the system of royal provinces. Having noted in a former number of this REVIEW the character and excellence of Professor Osgood's work, I do not need to repeat the tribute there paid to the admirable qualities that it possesses. The third volume not only fully maintains the high standard of scholarship already set by the volumes previously issued, but also surpasses them in importance in that it deals with a subject hitherto largely ignored by writers on colonial history. Ignorance and indifference together with inaccessibility of material whereon to base an adequate study of the British system and policy may account for the fact that so important a phase of our history has thus been allowed to go by default. Professor Osgood is fortunate in having control of one essential source of knowledge—the British State and Departmental Papers, the majority of which are calendared for the period in question. For the eighteenth century he will probably have few such aids, since for the period to 1760 the calendared documents are limited to the single series of Treasury Board Papers to 1745. Calendars of the Domestic and Colonial Papers covering the period are not likely to appear for many years to come, and in the main the evidence for the British system during the first half of the eighteenth century will have to be extracted by hard labor from the original manuscripts.

The underlying purpose of Professor Osgood's volume is to present the British system of colonial control in all its aspects—organization and policy at home, relations of every sort with the American colonies over seas and the rise of the royal system. In the execution of his plan Professor Osgood begins with the origin and character of the organs of imperial control, a chapter all too short in view of its importance,

and then passes on to discuss the overthrow of the Virginia Company of London, the attempted annulment of the Massachusetts Charter and the history of Virginia as a royal colony until the coming of Berkeley as governor in 1641. Taking up again the thread of central control, he reviews the attitude of the home government toward the colonies during the Civil War, the Interregnum and the Restoration, and traces briefly and with some omissions the history of the bodies in charge of colonial affairs. The chapters devoted to these aspects of his subject seem to me the most significant and suggestive portions of his book, and the single chapter on the acts of trade is a contribution of unusual importance, for though American and English writers have dealt with the navigation acts for a century or more, little progress has hitherto been made in determining their origin and character and the circumstances under which they were passed. The remainder of the volume treats of the history of New York, New Hampshire and Virginia as royal colonies, of Bacon's rebellion and the royal commission of 1677, of the attempt to consolidate the northern colonies under Sir Edmund Andros and of the revolutions that followed in Massachusetts, New York and Maryland. A final section summarizes the conclusions thus far reached.

Professor Osgood reiterates his belief that through the Stuart period ran a more or less definite colonial policy which aimed to subordinate the colonies to the royal will. He states this belief more cautiously than in his former volumes, yet I am not convinced that the evidence which he presents warrants any such conclusion. It does not seem enough to say that the Stuart policy aimed to maintain "the sovereignty of England over the colonies in order that the maximum of advantage for both, but especially for the realm, might be secured" (p. 145). This statement might apply quite as well to the policy of William III. or of George I. as to that of Charles I. or Charles II. Professor Osgood agrees that the Restoration policy differed from that of the early Stuarts in that it laid greater emphasis on questions of trade and defense and less on ecclesiastical relations. He also dates the beginnings of a definite policy with 1675, but believes that the later Stuarts, whether consciously or not, revised certain principles of action that were characteristic of the attitude of Charles I. As he further indicates that the later Stuarts wished to establish a centralized colonial system analogous to that of France, he certainly implies that some crude form of such a policy existed in the earlier period. I feel sure, on the other hand, that the earlier policy was not colonial at all in the later sense of the word, but only a phase of the political or ecclesiastical policy of the government. I should date the rudiments of a system of colonies from 1655, and not from 1665, as Professor Osgood does, and should date the beginnings of a definite colonial programme much farther than 1675, perhaps even to 1650. At any rate the instructions issued to the Lords of Trade in 1675 merely repeat the terms embodied in the earlier Povey and Shaftesbury drafts. But the whole question is at present incapable

of exact determination and will remain undeterminate until the instructions to plantation boards and colonial governors, the acts and proceedings of these boards, and the orders and decrees of the Privy Council during the seventeenth century are examined, analyzed and compared.

Professor Osgood has certainly made good his case so far as the principles underlying the Navigation Act of 1660 are concerned. He shows that in essence these principles were enunciated as early as 1621 in connection with the exportation of tobacco from Virginia, and he traces their further expression as late as 1627. This date can be extended to 1637 as the following letter from the Privy Council to the governor of Virginia shows:

"By a letter of the 16th of August last we did authorize and require you not to permit any strangers to trade within that colony of Virginia by shipping in regard of the prejudice which doth generally grow and is likely to increase as well to his Majesty's customs and the shipping of his kingdom as to the plantation itself. And did likewise expressly require you to take bond of all his Majesty's subjects there that they shall land their goods here in England and not elsewhere; forasmuch as we have been informed that our directions in that behalf have not been put in due execution, but that some strangers have lately traded there and some English ships laden with tobacco have gone directly for Holland and there sold the same. We cannot but greatly marvel at your neglect, especially in a matter of such great consequence and do therefore again strictly charge and in his Majesty's name command you to see our aforesaid directions carefully and fully executed." July 14, 1637.

In this letter are virtually embodied the doctrines of British-owned ships and of "enumerated" commodities. As the latter doctrine does not appear to have been adopted, even in principle, during the Interregnum, it may be considered peculiarly a Stuart possession. Professor Osgood's hope that when the manuscripts of Parliament shall be arranged and examined, material will be found throwing light on the passage of the navigation acts (p. 209, note) is unfortunately not likely of fulfillment. Investigation has not disclosed the existence of any such material.

We owe too much to Professor Osgood for his illuminating and forcible presentation of British policy to find fault with the limitations which he has imposed upon himself. He frankly disclaims any intention of dealing with the larger problem of British colonial administration, but he would assuredly have given us a more symmetrical exposition of British aims and purposes had he taken more space, even at the expense of some of the pages devoted to the details of colonial history, wherein to exhibit the principles and methods of imperial control as applied to all the colonies taken together. He would not, I am sure, have committed himself to the following statement had he kept in mind the larger colonial world: "So slight were the dealings of the crown with the other

colonies, that its relations with New England really give character to the imperial administration until after 1680" (p. 512). Such a statement as this is based on an inadequate survey of the British system in actual operation.

Next to his treatment of British policy, Professor Osgood has made his most valuable contribution to colonial history in his admirable treatment of the many royal commissions in America. From the first sent to Virginia in 1623 to the last despatched in 1676 for the suppression of Bacon's rebellion, he has traced the varying fortunes of these commissions in great detail. Not only has he given them a prominence they have never received at the hands of the older writers, but he has taken great pains to deal with them justly and impartially. The most elaborate of his accounts concerns the commission of 1664 sent to New England, and we may infer that it was from a study of the words and acts of this commission that he has drawn the evidence for his definition of Stuart policy. If so, then that which he deems a Stuart policy is really the policy of but one member of that line, James, duke of York.

It is impossible, here, to treat even in brief, of the many incidents, movements and personages, which Professor Osgood has discussed with so much insight and good judgment. This volume like the others must be read thoroughly and thoughtfully. In the end the reader will rise from its perusal with larger views of colonial history and with a higher appreciation of the determination and earnestness of the home authorities in their effort to develop a colonial system which should promote the welfare of Great Britain and the colonies alike. Their ideals should be interpreted not in the light of later events in America but in the light of contemporary notions regarding the relation of the colonies to the mother-country.

Upon a few scattered points further comment may be made. Professor Osgood is uncertain whether or not Governor Yeardley secured a hearing before the Privy Council in 1625 and whether or not an inquiry into the origin and provisions of the Massachusetts Charter was held before the same body in 1634. It is of interest to know that the Register is silent on both points. The commission issued to the Council for Plantations of 1670, which Professor Osgood believes not to be extant (p. 280, note), is to be found among the Shaftesbury Papers. The form "Declared Account, Privy Seal" (p. 196, note) is a reference not known to the Public Record Office and I have tried in vain to discover the collection or series to which Professor Osgood refers. Students of the history of the British departments are inclined to think that the complicated system of passing a charter through the seals was maintained not "to protect the rights and interests of the king", as Professor Osgood says (p. 19), but for no higher purpose than to furnish fees for officials. One cannot help wishing that in referring to the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, Professor Osgood had not adopted the form "Colonial Papers", which should be restricted exclusively to the manu-

script volumes in the Record Office; and as he used "Cal. S. P. Dom." for the Domestic Papers it seems reasonable to insist that he should have used "Cal. S. P. Col." for the Colonial Papers. In a foot-note to his discussion of the British commissioners in Virginia (p. 284, note 2), he refers to the fact that Sir John Berry claimed to possess unusual powers for the suppression of Bacon's rebellion. It is worthy of note that the claim was well founded, for among the Admiralty Papers may be found the official warrant authorizing Berry to impress ships, boats and men in Virginia, if necessary. On pages 252 and 291, Professor Osgood says that the compensation of 600 pounds a year allowed Culpeper in lieu of his claims in Virginia was met by a tax levied on the colony. According to the Treasury Papers this item was charged not against the colony but against the account of the military establishment in America and so was paid by the British government.

There are a few errors in the volume of a comparatively trifling character. "Possibly a month before" in a note on page 149 should read "three and a half months before"; for the sake of clearness "committee for plantations" on page 171 should read "committee of the Privy Council for Plantation Affairs"; in speaking of the "council for foreign plantations" in 1675, Professor Osgood probably has in mind the Lords of Trade (p. 218); he is wrong in saying that the Council of Trade of 1660 was limited in its interest to domestic trade only (p. 281), and he is also wrong in thinking that the Council of 1672 was a consolidation of the two councils of 1660, for the "consolidation" was merely the taking over by the Council for Foreign Plantations of 1670 of the functions of the Council of Trade appointed in 1668. Professor Osgood perpetuates two time-honored but apparently doubtful traditions: one of the "common hangman" who in 1677 drove the Virginia commissioners from Berkeley's house and whom Virginia historians tell us never existed; the other of the hasty and summary passing of the Stamp Act of 1765 (p. 210, note), a belief that investigators assert is based on no adequate foundation.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Social Life of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century. By PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE. (Richmond, Va.: Whittet and Shepperson. 1907. Pp. 268.)

THE *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* by Mr. Bruce is now followed by this companion study, concerned with the social life, in the narrower sense, of the upper classes. It is to be followed, as the author tells us, by successive monographs on religion and morals, education, legal administration, military system and political conditions, completing a study under the head of "Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century"

The present volume shows the same attention to detail as do the earlier volumes, although the author complains of the paucity of materials that directly touch his subject. Nevertheless, he prints an exten-